

From: Jacobson, Erik B (RegRel)
Sent: 1/3/2014 2:26:27 PM
To: Franz, Damon A. (damon.franz@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: RE: CES-21

Do you know when we might see a new CES-21 PD?

-----Original Message-----

From: Franz, Damon A. [mailto:damon.franz@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Thursday, January 02, 2014 7:04 PM
To: Jacobson, Erik B (RegRel); Turhal, Cem
Subject: RE: CES-21

Thanks Erik. Is there something about January 20 that makes it important to file by then? I'm wondering why you wouldn't wait until the Commission issues a Decision on this before filing.

Damon

-----Original Message-----

From: Jacobson, Erik B (RegRel) [mailto:EBJ1@pge.com]
Sent: Monday, December 30, 2013 5:03 PM
To: Franz, Damon A.; Turhal, Cem
Subject: RE: CES-21

Damon,

We are only planning on filing one supplemental advice letter on January 20th, unless directed to do something different by the Commission in its decision to modify the program. Similar to our April advice filing, our January 20 AL will include the business cases and budgets for the two projects we propose to pursue in light of and consistent with SB 96 (cyber security and grid integration). This will allow the Commission to consider our AL simultaneously with its consideration of modifications to D.12-12-031.

Does that make sense? Happy to discuss with you further. I'm in the office all week.

Erik

-----Original Message-----

From: Franz, Damon A. [mailto:damon.franz@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, December 30, 2013 3:22 PM
To: Jacobson, Erik B (RegRel); Turhal, Cem
Subject: RE: CES-21

Thanks Erik. Will your supplemental filing essentially contain the proposal that was filed in the Dec. 1 report?

And then would you file another supplemental after the Commission votes on a Decision clarifying the program in light of SB 96?

Damon

-----Original Message-----

From: Jacobson, Erik B (RegRel) [<mailto:EBJ1@pge.com>]
Sent: Saturday, December 28, 2013 11:54 AM
To: Franz, Damon A.; Turhal, Cem
Subject: Re: CES-21

Our plan is to file a supplemental AL that is consistent with SB 96 and supersedes the original filing in its entirety. We plan to file by January 20th. This will make our original filing moot. Please let me know if you have concerns with this approach.

----- Original Message -----

From: Franz, Damon A. [<mailto:damon.franz@cpuc.ca.gov>]
Sent: Friday, December 27, 2013 04:26 PM
To: Jacobson, Erik B (RegRel); Turhal, Cem <cem.turhal@cpuc.ca.gov>
Subject: RE: CES-21

Hey Erik-

Did you guys ever withdraw AL 3379G/4215E (the CES-21 Research Plan)? We still have it listed as an open Advice Letter in our system, but it's pretty much moot now as a result of AB 96. Given that it was superseded by Legislation, its probably more appropriate to do a withdrawal than a rejection.

Damon

-----Original Message-----

From: Jacobson, Erik B (RegRel) [<mailto:EBJ1@pge.com>]
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2013 1:54 PM
To: Franz, Damon A.; Lee, Audrey
Subject: CES-21

Audrey and Damon,

The 3 IOUs would like to schedule a meeting with you in mid November to discuss our joint Dec 1 report. Do you have any availability on Friday, Nov 15th?

Erik

PG&E is committed to protecting our customers' privacy.

To learn more, please visit <http://www.pge.com/about/company/privacy/customer/>

PG&E is committed to protecting our customers' privacy.

To learn more, please visit <http://www.pge.com/about/company/privacy/customer/>

PG&E is committed to protecting our customers' privacy.

To learn more, please visit <http://www.pge.com/about/company/privacy/customer/>